

REMARKS

Reconsideration and entry of the above amendments and these remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 23 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-15 are canceled and claims 16-22 are withdrawn from further consideration. Claims 23-27 remain pending.

The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant believes that the Examiner meant to rejected claim 25. Claim 25 has been amended to define the embodiment more clearly and thus, obviate the rejection. In particular, claim 25 as amended more clearly recites the features disclosed at page 8, line 25 to page 9, line 11 of the specification. Regarding the Examiner's contention that the metering orifices are located "about and along" the longitudinal axis, it is noted that this was corrected in the previous Amendment by amending claim 23. Furthermore, claim 25 does not further define the metering orifices, but further defines the flow channel.

The pending claims are considered to be in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Xu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner contends that Xu discloses "a first channel surface (lower portion of 16 that defines upper portion of 30) extending obliquely to the longitudinal axis (14)". Applicant disagrees.

The first channel surface (lower portion of 16) of Xu extends perpendicular to the longitudinal axis 14, not obliquely. As indicated at page 8, line 25 to page 9, line 2 of Applicant's specification, it is important for the flow channel 560 to taper to maintain a generally constant area of fuel flow. From the Merriam-Webster dictionary, oblique means "neither perpendicular nor parallel: inclined". Since Xu does not disclose the inclined first channel surface as claimed, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

To further advance prosecution, claim 23 has been amended to recite an unobstructed flow channel. In Xu, the flow of fuel in the flow channel 30 is obstructed by the obstructions 27.

Regarding claim 25, Xu does not disclose a flow channel wherein a product of the first distance and first height is generally equal to a product of the second distance and second height ($d_1h_1 = d_2h_2$). Since the flow channel 30 of Xu does not taper, $h_1 = h_2$ in Xu, which would require $d_1 = d_2$ in Xu. The claim requires that d_1 be different from d_2 . Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

All rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Stemberger
Registration No. 36,017
Attorney for Applicant
Tel. No. (202) 261-1014

Date: November 22, 2010

Customer No. 79912